



Progressivism is a political worldview defined by the negation, rejection, & opposition to conservatism; an acknowledgement that no identity turns one into a "subhuman", & an advocacy of what would follow from the nonexistence of conservatism: statelessness, egalitarianism, decentralization, freedom of identity, free love, & an established solidarity where all races, gender identities, sexualities, ages, mentalities, & general beings are viewed as equals & held to the same standard of non-hierarchical organization, anti-discrimination, & respect of identity.

However, a great many individuals tend to falsely use the label of "progressivism" despite being nothing of the sort, still engaging in conservatism against paraphiles and TransID beings, so for the sake of being distinct from the falsely labeled "progressives" who are actually conservatives, *true* progressives are to label themselves "Consistent Progressives". Consistent Progressivism says that *all* forms of conservatism are to be prohibited, and that for a truly liberatory society to thrive, there can be zero tolerance for intolerance. Obviously this would mean throwing out the patriarchy, heteronormativity, transphobia, and ideas of those sorts, as well as things that a lot of falsely labeled "progressives" will usually stay away from, such as ageism and the family institution, the concept of "marriage" being more than a social agreement, and the vast majority of influence that can be attributed to religion.

But there remains a topic that has to be touched on for a full progressivism to be established: the existence of the state. The state, also referred to as the government, is by far one of if not *the* most influential institution to ever come into being. To most it is assumed just to be a sort of "governing body" that keeps society in balance, that funds itself by the goodwill of everyone to pay their "fair share" to it as the price for a civilized society.

To a Consistent Progressive though, this portrait of the state has to be fallacious in many ways: first and foremost, that the state, in order to even meet the very low bar that falsely labeled "progressives" have set for it to be a good thing, has to at a minimum forbid discrimination. However, it has been shown numerous times historically that as the state grows, it only becomes *ever more* discriminatory. In one of the most extreme examples of state power taken to its logical conclusion, in the old Soviet Union, it was "identifying its enemies by "ethnic origin."", making it so "171,781 Koreans were deported from the Soviet Far East", having "announced measures against "hostile" ethnic groups, "spy-diversionary contingents" among "nationals," and undocumented "immigrants."". The USSR also passed a piece of legislation called "Article 121", a bill in which "under Article 121 of the criminal code, a holdover from the Soviet era, "sexual relations between men are punishable by prison terms of up to five years."" Uladzimir Valodzin explains that this wasn't even exclusive to the Soviet Union; this conservatism was spread throughout their controlled territories as well, as "different republics of the Soviet Union had different Criminal Codes", such as Belarus, which passed Article

119 where "a male homosexual act (muzhelozhstvo) shall be punished by imprisonment for a term of up to five years".

In the USSR, "Stalin's anti-sodomy law of 1933-1934 had only targeted male same-sex acts, and its retention after his death "bolstered the principle of gender difference in the treatment of sexual crime" while leaving women subject to a "second wave of medicalization" as psychiatrists turned significant attention toward women after 1953. (The first wave of Soviet medicalization of women's homosexuality was in the 1920s.)". There was also rampant antisemitism and nationalism, particularly that "Stalin's attitude [towards the Jews] seems to have been based in part on what he took to be Hitler's successful use of anti-Semitic demagoguery. It was certainly also due to his increasing Russian nationalism, to which he felt, most, or many, Jews were not truly assimilable. And the idea of a special Jewish predilection for capitalism is of course to be found in Marx.".

The USSR is an obvious example of statism becoming consistent conservatism when taken to its logical conclusion, but it will come to be found that this happens in every single case; other notable ones including but not

limited to Mao Zedong's China for example, where the "sexual castration of "sexual deviants"" was practiced, Pinochet's Chile where "the military junta that assumed power denigrated leftists and progressives as maricones [faggots], and violently targeted queer communities. Especially in major cities such as Santiago, queer people were tortured and killed by right-wing death squads", Pol Pot's "Democratic Kampuchea" Cambodia where "people belonging to sexual minorities such as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender [LGBT] people, were forced to experience specific forms of gender-based violence and sexual violence that were not experienced by the majority of Khmer people. In addition, the intersection of discrimination and perpetration of violence were affected by social status or religion", and of course, the most consistent form of conservatism ever practiced in Nazi Germany, where over six million Jewish people were executed as well as hundreds of thousands of homosexual individuals.

There is solid reasoning behind why when state power grows, so too does conservatism with it, and it has nothing to do with the utopian "if the right people were in power" narrative. It is that all forms of government, by their nature, are a *form* of conservatism. This is not something that can be fixed merely by transferring

power from the federal government to the local state governments either; because doing that leaves open a potential for the reawakening of the Confederacy, where [open enslavement of black people was widespread](#).

To get a proper view of why statism is a form of conservatism by its nature, the nature of the state first has to be understood to not be the false view of being merely a passive "governing body" as it is commonly assumed to be, but rather as a centralized monopoly of defense that closes off the entry of competitors who would do what they do, thus elevating them to such a centralized status. The government is not a passive entity at all, but rather a monopolistic one, predicated on the false conservative pretense of there being some minority class of individuals able to have the complete and final say over how individuals love each other, identify as, pleasure themselves, or even exist if they happen to hold a "problematic" identity.

A monarchist-type neoclassical liberal may argue even in the face of the government tending towards conservatism, that if it were possible to establish a minimalistic government that only ever passed anti-discrimination laws and never infringed on the personal lives of anyone except to stop conservatism

then the government would be ideal, and though the neoclassical is well-intentioned in their beliefs here, you could grant them these conditions and they'd still run into one critical problem: the basis of how governments come into being.

Governments are not floating entities that exist in a void, but rather are a structure arising from a specific set of human beliefs, broadly classed as the "conservative mindset", because said beliefs that allow for a government to come into being would indeed be conservative. In the first place, for a government to exist, it needs have societal acceptance, and it also needs to be able to get funding. Neoclassicals may believe the way they do so is a just and moral means, but fail to account for that no one actually agrees to the structures allowing the government to be funded on their own; otherwise they would fund them of their own volition. Governments extract funding not from voluntary contribution from progressives, but rather by coercing them through threats of violence. If a progressive did not want to fund the government but rather wanted to fund a means to combat conservatism in their own way, they would be forced to fund the government anyway, lest they face solitary confinement.

It is this coercion that allows governments to remain afloat; fundamentally, they are central planners, and it is for this reason that even the utopian neoclassical state does not escape the inherent discrimination of a minority class being able to steal from, thus aggressing on everyone else; everyone not in the state is reduced to subhuman status as they are subject to this theft insofar as any state exists.

From this baseline understanding of the state as inherently a conservative entity all the logical implications of the state becoming more conservative as it grows can then be derived; as insofar as there is a minority bureaucratic class of individuals with some sort of magical right to aggress on everyone else, the "subhumans", there will be an inevitably incentivized rush of competition to join the class such that the individuals, politicians, who get in, can be the discriminators and not the discriminated.

From there the only question that remains for the inevitable growth of conservatism to go forth from the nature of the state would be, "why stop at discrimination via theft"? Patriarchs, racists, sexists, homophobes, transphobes, ableists, ageists, antisemites, and all other kinds of conservatives have a higher incentive than

anyone else to join the state, because fundamentally it is the tool by which they can exert their conservatism within society, as already the societal conditions for them to do so would be put in place by evidence that the state exists.

And insofar as the conservatism exists and the conservative mindset prevails and convinces the critical mass of people that it needs that this discrimination is not something that should be actively opposed, the state can continue to exist as conservatism continues to grow unharmed.

A truly progressive society must therefore necessitate that the complete and total abolition of conservatism must include the complete and total destruction of the state apparatus; because of the state being a conservative institution, Consistent Progressivism must therefore necessitate *decentralized* force to abolish conservatism. For this reason it can henceforth be understood that any individuals following an ideology advocating for the continued existence of the state, even if they deny the inevitable implications of it, can only be seen as inconsistent conservatives, which includes all non-Consistent “progressives”.